

### **Remarks**

Claims 1, 3-6, 9-12, 14-19, 21-22 and 24 are pending. Reconsideration of presently pending claims 1, 3-6, 9-12, 14-19, 21-22 and 24 is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### **Rejections under 35 USC 103**

Claims 1, 3-6, 9-12 and 14-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang, et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No.2003/0233290 hereinafter referred to as “Yang”) in view of Hagen, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,748,287 hereinafter referred to as “Hagen”). Claims 21-22 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang in view of Hagen in further view of Arackaparambil, et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0156548 hereinafter referred to as “Arackaparambil”). Applicant traverses the rejections.

In the previous response (March 22, 2011), Applicant showed that the claims include features that are not taught by the cited art. In the Final Action of June 7, 2011 (hereinafter, “Final Action”), the Examiner provides responses to Applicant’s arguments. Final Action at 25-32. Applicant addresses the Examiner’s responses below.

**The cited combination of references does not teach the abnormality alert of claims 1, 6, and 21.**

In the previous response, Applicant showed that the cited combinations of Yang and Hagen (and in the case of claim 21, Arackaparambil as well) does not teach the claimed abnormality alert. Specifically, Yang explains at paragraph [0009] that its system will allow for fast identification of abnormal events for the user. But allowing a user to infer abnormal events quickly, as in Yang, is not the same as providing an abnormality alert, and therefore, Yang fails to teach the claimed abnormality alerts. In response, the rejection cites passages at paragraphs [0021], [0050], [0072], [0093], and [0186] of Yang. Final Action at 26-27. It appears to be the position of the Examiner that Yang teaches exchanging information, including alerts, and that such information exchange teaches the claimed abnormality alerts. However, exchanging information, including alerts, is not enough to teach the claimed abnormality alerts, and the Examiner’s response does not show that Yang’s alerts teach abnormality alerts. Yang simply

does not provide enough detail to disclose providing an abnormality alert, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

**The cited combination of references does not teach a secondary provider defining a first event element and a primary provider modifying the first event element.**

Furthermore, claim 6 recites, “assigning event elements to the product includes the secondary provider defining a first event element using a first computer system associated with the secondary provider and the primary provider modifying the first event element using a second computer system associated with the primary provider.” Applicant showed in the previous response that the cited combination of Yang and Hagen does not teach this feature. In response, the rejection cites Yang at [0070-71] to show a computer network where a buyer and supplier communicate and also cites the work in progress (WIP) reports of Hagen. Final Action at 27-28. Thus, it appears to be the Examiner’s position that a computer system network shared by multiple entities, modified to allow a WIP report, teaches the above-recited feature.

However, neither Yang nor Hagen teaches a secondary provider defining a first event element and a primary provider modifying the first event element. The rejection attempts to explain as follows:

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Yang and Hagen in order to provide a means for interconnecting multiple providers to a semiconductor supply chain system in order to define and/or modify supply chain task information in an efficient and improved system that optimizes the supply chain management task information flow, where the improved system is capable of communicating WIP essential information occurring during all stages of the supply chain management system. (Final Action at 28).

From the above-quoted passage, it is not clear how the rejection combines Yang and Hagen to show defining a first event element or modifying the first event element. In fact, the above-quoted passage from the Final Action does not even assert that the references teach defining a first event element or modifying the first event element (which is consistent with Applicant’s position that the cited references fail to teach the feature). Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**The cited combination of references does not teach determining a future location for the product and the associated information through the virtual fab.**

Claim 21 recites, “instructions for determining a future location for the product and the associated information through the virtual fab via the enterprise control entity.” The rejection cites Yang at paragraphs 0165-0167, 0085-0087, 0018, 0023, and 0072, and Applicant showed that the cited passages teach a lot tracking system at various stages of the supply chain, but not one of the passages teaches determining a future location. In response, the rejection cites Tables 1 and 2 and paragraph [0075] of Yang, specifically, where Yang describes a “ship-to location.” Final Action at 31. Applicant does not admit that Yang’s ship-to location teaches determining a future location for the product. But Applicant does note that the ship-to location does not teach determining a future location for the associated information. For at least this reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

**Dependent Claims 2-5, 9-12, 14-19, 22, and 24**

Dependent claims 2-5, 9-12, 14-19, 22, and 24 depend from and further limit independent claims 1, 6, and 21 and therefore are deemed to be patentable over the prior art.

**Conclusion**

An early formal notice of allowance of claims 1, 3-6, 9-12, 14-19, 21-22 and 24 is requested. A personal or telephonic interview is respectfully requested to discuss any remaining issues in an effort to expedite the allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,




Thomas W. Kelton  
Reg. No. 54,214

Dated: July 20, 2011

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP  
Customer No.: 42717  
Telephone: 972/739-6923  
Facsimile: 214/200-0853  
Client Matter No.: 2003-0527 / 24061.105  
File: R-281135\_1.DOC

**Certificate of Service**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via EFS-Web on July 20, 2011.

  
Linda Ingram